

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-33 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-2 and 4-33 stand rejected. Claim 3 has been previously cancelled, and Claims 1, 13-16, 19, 27, 29-32 have been amended herein. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application, drawings and claims as originally filed and, as such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 11-17, 19, 27-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kleinschnitz (U.S. Pat. No. 5,253,184; hereinafter "Kleinschnitz"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicants note that Kleinschnitz appears to disclose a machine initiated maintenance system for use with printer systems 40-42. In Kleinschnitz, it appears that a machine, such as a printer 40, can send an error log and operating parameters over communication links 50-53 to a regional maintenance system 30 and in turn to a central maintenance system 1. Each level of maintenance system includes a database of possible solutions for the error in the customer replaceable item, such as printer 40. In contrast, Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

...receiving an incoming message from at least one specific user of the plurality of users, where the incoming message characterizes a **mobile platform technical issue** relating to the mobile platform...(emphasis added).

Independent Claim 19 has been amended to recite:

...determining whether any reusable solutions of the knowledge base addresses a **mobile platform technical issue** regarding said mobile platform;

verifying **whether** an individual has authoring access to the knowledge base...(emphasis added).

Independent Claim 27 has been amended to recite:

...receiving an incoming message over a computer network from a customer, where the incoming message characterizes **a mobile platform technical issue associated with the mobile platform;**

importing a first set of **mobile platform related data** from the incoming message into one or more search roles of an inquiry;

* * *

verifying **whether** an individual has authoring access to the knowledge base, with the authoring access **restricted** to subject matter experts of the manufacturer of the mobile platform;

* * *

generating a new reusable solution based on the authoring input **when the individual has authoring access**...(emphasis added).

Independent Claim 32 recites:

...a distributed tool for maintaining the knowledge base in accordance with characterizations of **aircraft technical issues** submitted to the computer-based medium from individuals in an aircraft manufacturer enterprise; and

a security model for **selectively allocating** read and write access to the computer-based medium to the knowledge base between the individuals in the manufacturer enterprise and individuals in an **aircraft operator enterprise** (emphasis added).

In view of the above discussion, Applicants respectfully assert that Kleinschnitz does not teach, suggest or disclose each and every feature of Claims 1, 19, 27 and 32. In this regard, Applicants note that Kleinschnitz does not teach, suggest or disclose receiving an incoming message that characterizes a mobile platform technical issue relating to a mobile platform (Claim 1), determining whether any reusable solutions of the knowledge base addresses a mobile platform technical issue regarding the mobile

platform (Claim 19), receiving an incoming message that characterizes a mobile platform technical issue associated with the mobile platform (Claim 27) or a distributed tool for maintaining the knowledge base in accordance with characterizations of aircraft technical issues (Claim 32). Further, Kleinschnitz does not appear to disclose importing a first set of mobile platform related data from the incoming message into one or more search roles of an inquiry (Claim 27), or verifying whether an individual has authoring access to the knowledge base (Claims 19 and 27), with the authoring access restricted to subject matter experts of the manufacturer of the mobile platform (Claim 27). Kleinschnitz also does not appear to disclose a security model that selectively allocates read and write access to the computer-based medium between individuals in the manufacturer enterprise and the aircraft operator enterprise (Claim 32).

Rather, at best, Kleinschnitz appears to disclose a maintenance system for servicing computer peripheral devices, such as printer systems, and does not disclose whatsoever a maintenance system for managing mobile platform technical issues, importing data regarding the mobile platform or maintaining a knowledge base in accordance with characterizations of aircraft technical issues. Applicants respectfully submit Kleinschnitz does not teach, suggest or disclose whatsoever the use of his maintenance system with mobile platforms or aircraft. Furthermore, Applicants note that it would be improper to modify Kleinschnitz to provide a maintenance system for a mobile platform as Kleinschnitz does not teach or suggest this modification.

In addition, Applicants note that Kleinschnitz appears to teach at best notifying an engineer associated with the central maintenance system that human input is needed, but does not disclose whatsoever verifying whether an individual has authoring access,

restricting authoring access to the database based on the particular type of individual, or the use of a security model that selectively allocates read and write access between individuals in the manufacturer enterprise and the aircraft operator enterprise. Thus, the system of Kleinschnitz just prompts that human input is needed, but does not teach, suggest or disclose any type of verification process associated with the individual providing the input or selectively allocating read and write access to the computer-based medium between individuals of a manufacturer enterprise and individuals in an aircraft operator enterprise. Applicants further note that it would be improper to modify Kleinschnitz to include such features as it would improperly modify the principle of operation of Kleinschnitz.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, as Kleinschnitz does not teach, suggest or disclose each and every element of Claims 1, 19, 27 and 32, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of these Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Further, as Claims 2, 11-17, 28-31 and 33 depend directly or indirectly from either independent Claim 1, 19, 27 or 32, Claims 2, 11-17, 28-31 and 33 should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth for Claims 1, 19, 27 and 32 above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of Claims 2, 11-17, 28-31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-10, 18, 20-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinschnitz. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to Claims 4-10, 18 and 20-26, Applicants note these claims depend directly or indirectly from either Claim 1, 19 or 27, and thus, should be in condition for


allowance for at least the reasons set forth for Claims 1, 19 and 27. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of Claims 4-10, 18 and 20-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/31/06

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686
Erica K. Schaefer, Reg. No. 55,861

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/chs